Applicant : Stijn Van Even et al.
Serial No. : 09/696,685
Filed : October 26, 2000
Page : 10 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 13865-081001

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending, with claims 1, 13, and 25 being independent. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 5-8, 15, and 17-20 recite allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as not including proper margins. Formal drawings are being filed with this amendment to address the Examiner's concerns.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification because the Chinese symbols "are not defined close to the location of first use." Applicant has amended claims 2, 14, and 26 to remove the Chinese symbols. Thus, the specification complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, which requires that the specification contain a "written description of the invention." Accordingly, applicant requests withdrawal of this objection.

The Examiner also has objected to the specification because the status of nonprovisional applications cited in the specification should be updated. The specification has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, applicant requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Informalities

The Examiner has objected to claim 13 as being informal. This claim has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, applicant requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 14, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection in view of the amendments to claims 2, 14, and 26 to remove the symbols to which the Examiner objected.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 25-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 25-36 have been amended to claim the functional descriptive material as embodied in a computer-readable media or a propagated carrier signal. In view of this amendment, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Independent claim 1 recites a method of computer-implemented speech recognition. The method includes performing speech recognition on an utterance to produce a recognition result for the utterance. The recognition result includes a command, a word, and a phrase. The method also includes determining if the word closely corresponds to a portion of the phrase and producing a speech recognition result if the word closely corresponds to a portion of the phrase.

Independent claim 13 recites a speech recognition system that implements a method like that of claim 1, and independent claim 25, as amended, recites a computer-readable medium, or a propagated carrier signal, including software instructions for implementing a method like that of claim 1.

Claims 1, 4, 9-13, 16, 21-25, and 33-36 have been rejected under 35. U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,601,027 ("Wright"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Wright does not describe or suggest determining if a word in a speech recognition result closely corresponds to a portion of a phrase in the speech recognition result, as recited in each of the independent claims.

Wright relates to a system for position manipulation in speech recognition. See Wright at col. 2, lines 19-24. The user of Wright's speech recognition software may select a block of

previously-recognized text using the voice command "Select <word1> through <word2>" rather than a typical mouse pointer or keyboard input device. See Wright at col. 2, line 26 to col. 3, line 26. The voice command is recognized by speech recognition software using a particular constraint grammar that permits the block of text to start with any word, <word1>, in a set of *previously-recognized* words and to end with any word, <word2>, in the set of *previously-recognized* words that appears later in the text than the first word spoken. See Wright at col. 3, lines 20-26.

For example, if the speech recognition system of Wright had previously-recognized the sentence "Today, I saw a giraffe at the zoo," a user may wish to select a portion of the text, that is, "saw a giraffe" in that sentence and, for example, replace it with different text, that is, "ate ice cream." To do so, under Wright's system, the user speaks the command "Select," plus the first previously-recognized word in the block of text to be selected "<saw>", the command "through," and finally, the last previously-recognized word in the block of text to be selected "<giraffe>." See Wright at col. 21, line 59 to col. 22, line 15; col. 24, lines 56-57 (using this example sentence).

The constraint grammar of Wright further was an "ordered" command to ensure that the instance of the word spoken after "select" is found *before* the instance of the word spoken after "through" in the previously-recognized text. In other words, if the previously-recognized sentence was "Today, I saw a giraffe at the zoo, but I also saw a flamingo," the fact that the command "select <saw> through <giraffe>" includes the "ordered" command would ensure that the block of text selected was "saw a giraffe" and not "giraffe at the zoo, but I also saw." See Wright at col. 21, line 59 to col. 22, line 15.

However, although Wright's system produces a recognition result that constitutes the command "select," the word "<word1>," and the phrase "through <word2> ordered," Wright does not determine if the word "<word1>" closely corresponds to a portion of the phrase "through <word2> ordered" of the recognition result. Instead, Wright merely describes comparing the two words in the command (<word1> spoken after "select" and <word2> spoken

after "through") to words that are present *in the previously-recognized text* rather than comparing the word "<word1>" to words in the recognition result containing the command.

For at least these reasons, Wright fails to describe or suggest determining if a word in a speech recognition result closely corresponds to a portion of a phrase in the speech recognition result. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable.

Claims 4, 9-12, 16, 21-24, and 33-36 depend from independent claims 1, 13, and 25 and are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 13, and 25 are allowable and for containing allowable subject matter in their own right. For example, claim 9 recites a step in the speech recognition method in which no speech recognition result is produced if the word does not correspond to a portion of the phrase. Because the system of Wright does not determine if the word closely corresponds to a portion of the phrase, for at least the reasons set forth above, Wright's system cannot perform any further functionality that is dependent on this method step.

Moreover, the Examiner points to col. 22, lines 30-38 of Wright as somehow showing that no speech recognition result is produced. However, this passage does not describe or suggest that no speech recognition result is produced. Rather, this passage merely explains how *previously-recognized* text is properly identified (by not considering incorrectly ordered words).

Accordingly, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/12/04

John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40227539.doc